



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

HOW TO NAME CHILDREN.

THERE are some things which we cannot reason out. Science fails to disclose the reason why the cyclone, in its semi-elliptical whirl moves from the right to the left in the Northern hemisphere, and from the left to the right in the Southern half of the globe ; and so too some unknown force directs the spiral course of the creeping vine. May there not be some subtle forces directing the fate of men ? Do natural laws govern only the movement of the winds or the growth of plants ? May not a name bestowed upon the helpless infant produce effects, and become "One of the few, the immortal names that were not born to die ?"

Our first parents and the prominent persons spoken of in Holy Writ seem to have had but one name: Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Moses, Aaron, and Joshua. But, passing without notice the intervening ages and coming down to our own times and confining ourselves particularly to our own country, if we examine the names of our great men we will be surprised at the preponderance of single-named (meaning but one name in addition to the surname) persons.

Let us go to the Revolution. Take the signers of the Declaration of Independence. First we find a committee appointed to draft it. They were Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, Sherman, and Livingston. None of these had middle names except Livingston. Of those who signed the Declaration, on the part of the States, there were as follows :

5 from Massachusetts, of whom one had a middle name.		
3 from New Hampshire, of whom none had middle names.		
2 from Rhode Island,	do.	do.
4 from Connecticut,	do.	do.
4 from New York,	do.	do.
5 from New Jersey,	do.	do.
9 from Pennsylvania,	do.	do.
3 from Delaware,	do.	do.
3 from Maryland,	do.	do.
3 from North Carolina,	do.	do.
4 from South Carolina,	do.	do.
3 from Georgia,	do.	do.
6 from Virginia, of whom two had middle names.		

So that out of the fifty-three signers there were only three who had more than one name.

In 1786 there was a commercial convention called to meet at Annapolis to consider the commercial relations of New York, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Virginia. Not a solitary delegate to that convention had a middle name.

In 1787 a convention was held to revise the Constitution, and out of the fifty-six delegates to this convention there were only five with more than one name.

Of the forty-eight who signed the Articles of Confederation on the 9th of July, 1788, only four had more than one name. Of the thirty-six speakers of the House during the first half century of the nation's existence, only twelve had more than one name. Of the five Chief Justices during the same period none had more than one name. (Now that there is a vacancy let double-named aspirants beware.) Of the thirty-one Associate Justices during the same period only five had more than one name. Of the eighteen Secretaries of State only two had middle names; of the eighteen Secretaries of the Treasury, only eight; of the twenty-six Secretaries of War, only nine; of the twenty-one Secretaries of the Navy, only eight.

We have had twenty-two presidents during our national existence. Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Van Buren, Tyler, Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan, Lincoln, Johnson, and Cleveland all entered into office without the unnecessary luggage of a middle name. These sum up fifteen out of the twenty-two, and all the "two-termers" are in the list except one (U. S. Grant). Under such circumstances, now that we approach a Presidential election is it not pertinent to inquire, "What's in a name?"

As far as I have been able to ascertain, only five ex-Senators became President: John Quincy Adams, Martin Van Buren, James Monroe, Andrew Jackson, James Buchanan—all of one name, except the ubiquitous Adams, who seems to have held every office of note in the country except the Chief Justiceship. As Grover Cleveland will be the Democratic nominee, it is well for the Republicans to remember that it seems to be an unwritten law that no Senator (particularly if he has a middle name) can be elected; and so, if they will take a Senator to test the rule, they have few to choose from. There is John Sherman, or Philetus Sawyer, or E. Hale, or J. Chace, or perhaps one or two more.

Is there not something in a name? Must not there be some influence, which we know not of, which, under the operation of cause and effect, produces such results as are cited above. It is true that there are instances of great men whose names are long and whose achievements are famous, but are they not few compared with the number of great men with single names?

PETER J. OTEY.

II.

OUR HOLD ON CUBA.

Do we want Cuba? Do we want her as an integral part of the Nation? Do we want her as a colonial possession? I think the unanimous voice of the country would answer "No!" to both interrogatories. But is there not another species of ownership which will confer upon us all the advantages which would accrue from annexation without hampering us with the responsibilities springing out of annexation? It seems to me that Mother Britain has taught us how to own Cuba without owning it—how to control Cuba without governing it—how to reap all benefits of Cuban possession without the expense and responsibilities of Cuban protection.

Over the savage and semi-civilized tribes and nations which the commercial and religious zeal of the subjects of Victoria have subjugated to British influence, Great Britain, as a nation, has established what she calls "Commercial Supremacy." In plain language, she permits these weaker races to buy their rum, their Brummagem idols, and their scanty needs of dry-goods, only from herself, and prohibits them—not by force, but by the "laws of trade"—from disposing of their native products in markets other than those controlled by Englishmen.

To be sure, we have no American opium that we need market at the points of bayonets or the muzzles of guns, upon unwilling and inoffensive Cubans; but, inasmuch as we improved upon the British Constitution, so likewise we may improve